DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 774 HE 024 599

AUTHOR	Bertilsson, Margareta; Nybom, Thorsten, Ed.
TITLE	From University to Comprehensive Higher Education: On the Widening Gap between "Lehre and Leben."
INSTITUTION	Council for Studies of Higher Education, Stockholm (Sweden).
REPORT NO	ISSN-0283-7692
PUB DATE	Jan 91
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Studies of Higher Education, P.O. Box 45 501, S-104 30 Stockholm, Sweden.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Studies of Higher Education and Research; n1 1991
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; Educational Philosophy; Educational Responsibility; Higher Education; *Research and Development; *Research Utilization; *Role of Education; School Business Relationship; *Student Development; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Von Humboldt (Wilhelm)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the transformation of the university ideal, as envisioned by Wilhelm von Humbolt, from cooperation between science and practical application (Lehre und Leben) and the belief in education and upbringing to a belief in material progress. The paper explores Humboldt's idea of a university, and to what extent it is or is not being realized in modern higher education, by examining the combination of imperatives that are viewed as necessary in regulating the activities of the ideal university. These imperative combinations are: (1) unite research and teaching; (2) unite through philosophy the various empirical sciences; (3) unite science and general upbringing; and (4) unite science with universal enlightenment. The conclusion from this examination is that the unity of research and education that once constituted the modern university has been broken up. Also, there are tendencies to disconnect research and teaching by creating a too specialized research that is closely attached to the demands of business. It is suggested that this separation of research and education threatens the student's ability to gain the broad sense of identity that modern democratic citizenship demands, thus broadening the gap between education and life. Contains 29 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ISSN 0283-7692

Studies of Higher Education and Research

A newsletter from the Council for Studies of Higher Education. Appointed by the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities.
Address: P O Box 45501, S-104 30 Stockholm, Sweden. Fax: 8-728 38 90.

Editor: Thorsten Nybom *1991:1*

ED333774

From University to Comprehensive Higher Education:

On the widening Gap between "Lehre und Leben"

by
Margareta Bertilsson
Department of Sociology, University of Lund

HE024511

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council for Studies of Higher Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The idea of a university is, ever since Wilhelm von Humboldt, synonymous with "the exemplary life form".[1] Here, the search for truth should be combined with an ambition to live a correct life. The university, or rather its idea, constituted a modern version of the Greek *polis*. Human history was to Humboldt a collective process of learning and formation which converged into a *Kulturstaat* and in a *Bildungsbürgertum*.[2] In this humanistic vision, the university played a central role.

It can certainly be doubted whether Humboldt's idea of a university ever materialized in the real world. Today we can very well ask if this old conception of a university has any relevance at all? The idealism -and humanism- which Humboldt represented is alien to us, and in his era, the German universities mainly graduated civil servants. Modern universities rest on completely different presumptions, such as: universities must secure growth in a particular region; it shall be the servant of both state and capital, as well as make higher education available to larger groups of citizens. All kinds of higher education can be found in the modern university. In this expansion, the university has lost the specific intrinsic value -to embody an "exemplary life form".

In this article, I will however argue that we still, in congratulatory speeches and in political memoranda, return to Humboldt's idea of, and belief in, the possibility of uniting the formation of both the individual and the collective, when we want to capture the spirit of the university. It is often said, for example, that the university will engender "critical reflection" in individuals, that it will give them both "general" and "specialised" competence. Today, research parks have grown up around the universities. These are supposed to utilise the creative thinking which the university contains and convert it into practice. The cooperation between science and practical upbringing which Humboldt held out as a promise has certainly been transformed from a belief in education and upbringing to a belief in material progress. Despite, or maybe because, of this shift in meaning, "the idea of a university" as it was concieved by Humboldt is worth paying attention to. With all its idealistic overtones, it is the only coherent and contemplated idea of a university which actually exists. Other modern concepts of a university which are based on the themes of education, success and happiness are loose fragments of the Humboldtian idea. Even if this idea has been designated as a "lifetime deception of the university" it is nevertheless a regulative ideal in a rationalistic societal vision which within itself also contains the value of science and education.[3] These ideals make up the very base of modern Western society. However, the structural background conditions of the university have radically changed since Humboldt's time, and it is against these changed conditions we must once again test "the idea of a university".[4]

The imperatives of the university

Let us take a closer look at Humboldt's "extravagant" idea of a university.[5] My characterisation refers to the combination of imperatives that should regulate the activities of the ideal university. It will at one and the same time:

1) *Unite research and teaching.*
2) *Unite through philosophy the various empirical sciences.*
3) *Unite science and general upbringing.*
4) *Unite science with universal enlightenment.*

The Humboldtian conception of a university breaks radically with earlier university traditions. The first universities in Bologna, Paris and Oxford were developed as centers for travelling students.[6] These centres had a privileged legal status, and they had a certain freedom to control their internal affairs. Their relations to the church and to the new nation-states varied. However, without a doubt, the ideals of humanism and the Renaissance were spread by these travelling students. We know the importance of the Wittenberg-student, Olaus Petri as far as Swedish history is concerned.[7] During the Late Middle Ages, the links between the universities and the emerging nation-states, and hence also to the supremacy of the kings, became even closer. The university developed into an educational center for the state to secure the demand of civil servants, especially priests and lawyers. In the universities of the Middle Ages, research had no independent standing. Instead, its practitioners had to defend God, the native country, and the emperor by using hair-splitting syllogisms.

There are basically three great university traditions; the English, the French, and the German. The English university was characterised by *colleges* whose foremost task initially, was to help needy students to achieve a tolerable life. Soon, however, these colleges developed into stations for the children of the privileged strata of society. It has often been said that Oxford and Cambridge neglected the empirical research which had its break-through during the 17th and 18th centuries. Instead, it was within the "Royal Societies" that the new empirical research was developed. The university in Edinburgh laid the basis for the Scottish Enlightenment long before these ideas reached the socially and economically more developed regions of southern England.

In France, the new research ideals were not fostered by the universities but by "the academies" of which *Collège de France* is the most famous. This weakened the position of the French universities, and they turned into pure educational centers in the shadow of the eminent academies.

The German university tradition was consolidated in the last part of the 18th century. The governments of the German *Länder* competed with each other, and they had a tolerant policy towards universities. It was in Germany that the so-called "research university" developed. At the inauguration of the Berlin University in 1810, the humanist and philologue Wilhelm von Humboldt(1767-1835) signed its *magna charta*. The university will, according to the Enlightenment tradition, be organised around its own research and teaching. The Humboldtian conception of a "free" university is sociologically interesting precisely because it expresses a complex of knowledge independent of church and state. The university should be a "republic" within the state -with its own "senate", "citizens", and guardians. The university was an "ideal society", a modern equivalence to the Greek *polis*. The true and correct life should be able to develop without interference.

It has been argued that the Humboldtian vision of a free university had its first real triumph with the appearance of the American research universities such as Johns Hopkins, Berkeley and Stanford. The soil to nurture such a university was completely different in North America.[8)] The American research universities, for example, did not take over the professorship (chair) from Europe but instead organised research and teaching under a "collegium" of equals, a *department*.

It is also in America that "graduate studies", which led to a Ph.D degree, were developed separately from undergraduate education. In contrast to the European, the American Ph.D thesis should be based on independent work, carried out by the Ph.d candidate - and not by order from a professor.[9)] The American organisation of departments subjects the individual professor to a different form of peer control, and as a consequence the doctoral students have a more independent position. The European professor's wilfulness is lacking in the American version. The American professoriate is in a way more "standardised", and this shift of authority from personal to peer power entails a higher degree of impersonality and, possibly, bureaucratisation, but it must also be weighed against the freedom from the state -and the church- which the American universities enjoy.

To divide university studies into a research part and a teaching part was also a result of the Humboldtian conception. The new empirical sciences demand discipline-oriented research. But a critical point in the Humboldtian university is the organisation of undergraduate teaching according to the latest research results in the respective disciplines. This vision must be considered as revolutionary at a time when university teaching in hundreds of years had been synonymous to the application of dogmatic exegetic and syllogisms to practically everything. When teaching instead is organised so that the students can take part in the latest empirical research, the old belief in authority disintegrates, and international trends can break

into an otherwise closed university world. The conception of a free university which organises research and teaching under its own administration, an academic senate, is central to the modern Enlightenment. The Humboldtian idea of a university is an important dimension of modern society.

There have been certain obstacles which have impeded -and still impede- a realisation of the Humboldtian vision. There are those who argue that the unity between research and teaching has become unbalanced and that this imbalance can have dangerous consequences both for the development of research and the complex of knowledge *and* for "the socialisation" of young individuals.[10] *Lehre und Leben* are no longer connected, perhaps to the detriment of both, and I will try to sort out the structural factors which influence and disturb the unity between research and teaching -the basic idea of the university.[11]

The expansion of higher education and research and the impact on its unity

Today's university probably in no way resembles the (elite) university which Humboldt had in mind almost 200 years ago. Of course, a few elite universities still remain in modern society. Oxford and Cambridge in Great Britain, Harvard, Stanford and Yale in North America could in certain respects be said to resemble the Humboldtian university. However, the majority of universities in the Western world, both old and new, diverge from the Humboldtian ideal on most points.

The higher education systems in all advanced industrial countries have expanded enormously during the last century, especially after 1950, and it is primarily the universities that have been affected by this expansion. The expansion has had two main causes, which of course are dependent on each other, but which can be discussed separately. On the one hand, it is a consequence of the modern industrial nation's need for a highly educated labor force. On the other hand, it can be seen as an answer to the demand for greater equality among different groups of citizens. Instead of allowing the university to be a matter of class, it is in the democratic political interest to make the university accessible to a broad stratum of the population.

Industry's need of a highly educated labor force has in recent years led to the creation of several regional "colleges" in Sweden outside the traditional university sector with an orientation towards distinctly practical occupations. In this connection, both business and various political interests have argued that it is valuable to anchor the theoretical university research in a practical context. In the course of this development, the university has had to undergo profound changes. In Sweden these changes are reflected in a changing terminology; the university is now merely a part of a comprehensive higher education system which includes several other colleges with mainly vocational orientation. On the whole, one could speak of a 'pragmatization' of the modern university. The diverse practical demands from the business com-

munity as well as the state threaten to undermine the constitutive idea of the university. In this paper, I shall nevertheless argue that the changing environment introduces a challenge for our understanding of what a university is -or what it could be. Accordingly, we need to reconsider the founding imperatives of the Humboldtian university.

The growth of the vocationally oriented colleges is in itself nothing new. Indeed, such institutions appeared in large numbers towards the end of the previous century and around the turn of the century. I am referring to institutes of technology; and veterinary and agricultural colleges. In contrast to the more recent ones, these older colleges were usually located close the old universities. The proximity allowed for regular university-contacts. These colleges which are related to the old prestigious professions still today enjoy a different social status than the new, regionally and politically decentralised colleges. The new ones are usually connected with sectorial interests -either to the region's specific economic needs or to the Swedish state's proclaimed effort to distribute higher education more equally across the country. Luleå in the far north, has today an Institute of Technology which is to serve the mining industry in *Norrland*(Northern Sweden). In Sundsvall, there is a college which specialises in research about -and education of- personnel in public health care and medical care; and there is a college in Karlstad which, among other things, specialises in educating recreation and day care personnel and tries to connect this previously practical education to research.

A specific characteristic of these colleges is that they do not have the same strong connections with professional knowledge interests; they are not discipline-oriented in the same way as the old universities. Neither can they provide the same breadth of teaching. The research carried out at these colleges is at risk of becoming "local" compared to the more cosmopolitan environment of the larger universities.[12)] Uniting research and teaching also constitutes an important goal for these new colleges, but for lack of international, discipline-oriented research of sufficient breadth and depth, these colleges risk developing into either pure teaching centers or service-centers of local industries. As a rule, the colleges do not have the right to offer doctoral studies. The same thing applies to "*Community Colleges*" in the USA and to "*Polytechnics*" in England. The unity of research and teaching does not exist in these new colleges; practical teaching dominates at the expense of the development of the internal knowledge base in research itself.

Even the old Swedish universities have been influenced by, and have had to adjust to, the changing surroundings. Undergraduate education is no longer organically and coherently connected to the development of knowledge and research within the respective disciplines. It must also adapt itself to the interests of working life and business. Of course, students still have the possibility of choosing "select courses", but they do so at their own expense, with the

risk of not receiving the guaranteed government loans and of not fitting into a specialised labor market after completing their studies.

However, the dominance of vocational training in the organisation of basic education has had different consequences for the old universities than for the new colleges. In the universities too, research and undergraduate education have been separated, and as a consequence research careers have become much more attractive for instructors than teaching careers. One external reason for this split in university careers can however be found in the fact that research to a large extent has left the university and been located in independent institutes associated with industry or sectorial interests. This research buys competence from the university and can with its financial resources attract the best researchers and students. Of course, this draining of competence threatens the internal vein of university research, and it risks making the already visible split between research and teaching even more obvious. For young researchers, it is more promising to accept fat external assignments than to take part in university teaching which lacks stimulus and entails a never-ending struggle with an expanding university bureaucracy. The gap between *Lehre und Leben* widens under such circumstances.

In North America a few universities can compete with industry and buy up "mega-stars", with the consequence that the difference which already exists between high-status and low-status universities increases even further. One can speak of a 'marketization' of the university which constitutes as big a threat to its constitutive idea as does the pragmatization in the low-status college system. In both cases external forces impinge on the university and shape its profile; the autonomy is threatened.

The enormous expansion of research both inside and outside the university has also changed the composition of personnel at the old universities in Sweden. In addition to a traditional, more or less permanent, employed teaching staff appointed by the government, according to merit and seniority, there is today a growing body of research personnel who are employed through external research funding. In 1987/88 at the University of Lund, the equivalent of 1 276 or nearly 25% were funded by external research funds.[13)] As a rule, these persons have no connections with undergraduate education and only in exceptional cases is it related to doctoral education. These pure researchers, today consisting of both professors and research assistants, are employed on contract, with access to the university's facilities. This swelling group is to an increasing extent their own employers. The university is to them merely an intermediary link in their work. Now, they can also -with the full support of their union- claim permanent positions as "university teacher"(*högskolelektor*) without having any relation whatsoever to regular teaching.

Naturally, these new groups also affect the composition of the administrative bodies of research institutes and the universities,[14] and they will also influence the loyalties and interests of the university, which are no longer limited to the traditional internal affairs(i.e. the best possible way to organise research and education) but instead include diverse external considerations. As a consequence the university has become unionized and as such subjected to claims of diverse origins, which are alien to the classical Humboldtian university and will gradually mean a growing politizisation.

The old university was an elite university, reserved for socially privileged groups, while the modern university attempts to widen social recruitment as well as satisfy the demands of the diversified personnel for reasonable wages and employment conditions. Thus, the demands to make the university more democratic has very heterogenous origins: the need of private industry for a well-educated labor force was not satisfied by a socially restricted access to the university. Instead the existing reserve of talent in lower social strata must be exploited. This demand was also expressed at the political level as a right for every individual to undergo higher education, given that he/she possessed the necessary competence. What once had been restricted(class) access, ideologically formulated as individual achievement and merit, was now expressed in the moral language of universal rights. The collectivization on the political level thus helped to articulate the practical interest of industry and commerce in dismantling what was conceived as the ivory tower of the classical university.

These new demands were channelled through the political sphere and put forward as political and social reforms; the new and swelling groups of research and administrative personnel at the university expected the university to meet their demands as employees. Even teachers gradually dared to express such demands. In Humboldt's time, university teachers -the *Privatdozenten*- could at best charge fees of students. Their positions as employees were particularly uncertain.

Students' demands for participation in decision-making(co-determination) is also a factor which can -but does not necessarily- undermine the unity of research and teaching. But their demands for relevance and action in the class-room are not necessarily compatible with the development of disciplines and of knowledge within the respective subjects. The democratisation both from above(the state), from within(new personnel groups) and from below (students) make the modern university undistinctive and undermine its specific intrinsic value. To me, the true challenge to the modern university is; how to safeguard its institutional intrinsic value and at the same time satisfy different democratic aspirations?

The modern university has loyalties vastly surpassing those existing in Humboldt's days. It is an organisation that at the same time, must satisfy a number of different internal and external demands. The question is, if the unity of research and teaching -as an aim of education and upbringing- is incorporated in the modern university, at all. Is it possible to connect practical education to research, which now is done on large scale, and rests on a different set of basic principles than those Humboldt advocated and believed in. It is not "understanding" which stands at the center of the activities of the modern university, instead it is material growth, expressed either at the regional or global level. The practical domination of the modern complex of knowledge and research has upset the balance between research and teaching. This has consequences for *Lehre und Leben*. Research separated from the context of individual life (*Lebenswelt*) runs the risk of going amuck. But a context of life which has been drained of rational understanding also runs the risk of developing its own lack of understanding and implacability. It is, in this regard, possible to find a structural equivalent in the university to what Daniel Bell once called *"Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism"*(1976).

Philosophy -the queen of the sciences

The second imperative of the Humboldtian vision of a university is based on the possibilities of philosophy to integrate the different empirical sciences into a harmonic unity. The prospects appear remote today. Philosophy has been reduced to an empirical science and has lost its sovereign position, a fact which seems to cause both a sense of joy and of confusion among philosophers.[15] The changes in the complex of knowledge and science can be described as a consequence of the "post-metaphysical conditions".[16]

The classical philosophy -from Plato to Hegel- is based on the presumption that Cosmos could be concieved of as a unitary rational system. It was the task of philosophy to safeguard this cosmic reason. In ancient philosophy, this unity was concieved as a link between the individual/temporary and the general/necessary. *Bios theoretikos* was a privileged condition for the true philosopher who left the worldly life and devoted himself to the excesses of thought. Since then, philosophy has been the bearer of exclusive reason. In comparison to the more profane experimental sciences, it has had an emphatic relation to the true and correct life. Now, the situation is changing which has created a problematic situation for philosophy.

An other important factor in this connection is the practical orientation of modern science. Instruments and laboratories are central components in the production of modern knowledge and science. Theoretical speculations must leave room for empirical testability. This practical orientation naturally influences philosophy's "transcendental" position: it becomes all the more untenable. The pervading secularisation in modern society affects ultimately philosophy whose -religious- content of meaning is vanishing. He who today tries to grasp modern philo-

In Humboldt's vision *Bildung* should also constitute an important social dividing line between individuals with full citizenship and those outside the social community. The Humboldtian concept of a university incorporated the thought of a *Bildungsbürgertum*. The bourgeoisie could, by using educational distinctions, differentiate itself from the mass of people. The bourgeoise had been denied access to the old regime by a system of privileges, but during the the 19th century education became a new mark of distinction, which separated the bourgoisie, both upwards and downwards. The Humboldtian university played an important role in the consolidation of a new dominating class. To form and educate the personalities of young people in accordance with truth and justice, became the primary obligation of the university. Education became the insignia of those who should hold leading positions in society. The reproduction of a social elite was firmly established in the Humboldtian university.

On the physical level, the unification of science and upbringing was facilitated by the protected and exclusive status of the traditional universities. A visit to Cambridge or Oxford, with their closed cloister-like "colleges", gives an idea of what a closed university life could - and can- mean. Life inside "the high gate" was both closed and regulated. Also the architecture of the old universities in Southern and Central Europe with their *pellargios* and beautiful *patios*, illustrates this seclusion. Inside these architechtural wonders a special conception of knowledge, orally transmitted among peers, could flourish. The Swedish universities in Uppsala and Lund(which are nation-state universities and therefore constructed in a different way from the old city-universities) are demarcated by parks, impressive episcopal mansions, cathedrals and -in the former case also- a royal castle. The American universities are generally designed as *campuses*, with department buildings and college-like student housing facilities. The universities in North America still have their own police force, which easily creates irritation in a generally black outer community. The campus area, with its beautiful green areas, is a true oasis in an otherwise vandalised ghetto environment. The police make sure that no outsiders encroach on the exclusive facilities such as libraries, swimming pools, and restaurants. Only in extraordinary circumstances, such as criminal investigations or in "revolutionary" times, can the regular police get into the campus. The tension between "town and gown" are built into the very architechture of the university, although its construction varies according to the existing conceptions. The tension is still there, not only in the old English university towns, but also around the modern American metropolitan universities. The importance of the external opposition has increased with the rise of prices on attractive land. The old universities are usually big land-owners, and they are successfully exploiting their assets.

The physical location still symbolises the exclusiveness of university life. These places mad, and makes, it possible, to unite science and upbringing through exclusive and close contacts between individuals. In the closed university, a complicated and carefully constructed social

ensemble between more or less "equals" -between teachers and students, between older and younger students- took place. In the old days the upbringing of students included an element of bullying. The education of individuals demanded a military type of discipline and obedience. The traditional rituals still exist in the hazing of new students -the so called "zeros"- which the relatively young institutes of technology and the medical faculties in Sweden stage at the beginning of the academic year.

Intimate relations between teachers and students are necessary for the students' upbringing. Swedish professors were up to this century told to live close to the university so they could associate with their students outside the seminar room. The "fellows" at Oxford and Cambridge must remain unmarried, and of course, they had to live in the colleges to be availiable at all time. The existing colleges still retain traces of the Medieval cloister. They are in Erwing Goffman's words "total institutions" which demand an absolute obedience and a total commitment of their members, and just like other total institutions they organise all spheres of life. This world contained -and contains- no women. These would only disrupt the sacred companionship between the students and their enthusiasm for study, by introducing an alien physical element and a sense of otherness which could break down the symbolic unity of peers.

In the Humboldtian vision, the university should constitute an important center of socialisation for the children of the educated classes. Within the walls of the university young students should be brought up to become good citizens and servants of the enlightened state. The students came to the university at a relatively young age. The university was an intermediary station between the parental home and the life of public service. As such, the university accepted an important social responsibility. The university teachers functioned as substitute parents, which is still the case in Oxford and Cambridge. "Fellows" meet their students regularly, at least once a week. The contacts are not only restricted to academic activities but include a large part of the social and private lives of the students.

But even if the students were brought up within the walls of the university, they did not always develop into obedient "elite" citizens. The universities allowed a privileged life, especially for those students who did not come from the socially privileged strata. The university "oasis" meant that students only reluctantly left the university and the university town, which eventually resulted in the appearance of "radical" hot beds around the university. The concentrated learning and upbringing in combination with the intense sense of social community in the university towns could easily become seed-beds of radical ideas against the existing social order. Thus, the closed university could have unforeseeable consequences. It does not al-

sophy of science discovers that the theory of truth has been invaded by different types of post-modern writers. According to them, there is no truth. Instead, we are told to search for a variety of truths. Philosophy tries to stimulate different perspectives instead of being primarily regulative. Modern philosophy reflects, in its own enlightened way, the practical orientation of modern science. It no longer searches for the transcendental perspective but wants instead to get its share of the fruits of practical life. Ethics and business morals are today examples of a new -and possibly profitable- field for the entrepreneurial philosopher.

In this change from the theoretical to the practical, Reason herself is affected. She was once thought of as a cosmic celebrity, but development entailed that subject and object were split from each other. Reason took refuge in the extraordinary(Kantian) subject. And even this sphere has been invaded by the (quasi)empirical sciences -sociology, psychology and linguistics. The transcendental sphere has been abandonned, and what remains is the heterogenous and individualised subject- spheres of different disciplinary approaches. The Hobbesian *dictum* of "the war of all against all" now even threatens the sphere of human understanding.[17)]

Modern social science has to an increasing extent begun to study the organization of situation-bound language and action, which create "realities"; facts are no longer thought of as entities existing independently of the involved subjects.[18)] Social science breaks in a flagrant way with philosophy's emphatic concept of truth; the former studies social and psychological conditions for the origin of truth, while philosophy has traditionally attempted to maintain a "sphere of justification" beyond time and place. This unbound sphere has gradually become increasingly difficult to percieve. Today a majority of philosophers of science would acknowledge the pragmatic and situation-bound conditions "behind" the production of truth.

The situativity of modern reason is also expressed in other, more polemic ways. Modern feministic theories for instance, maintain that the scientific truth concepts, as traditionally expressed in philosophical theories, have been gender as well as class determined. It is argued that a feministic concept of truth contains other dimensions than the abstract, and time and place unbound(male) reason. The situativity of reason makes philosophy itself decentralized in diverse practical contexts. Today, there are every possible type of philosophy: feministic, sociological, economic, biological, etc. It is gradually becoming more difficult to unite all these situation-determined and gender-determined philosophies into a single all-embracing, comprehensive one. Accordingly, the extraordinary position of philosophy as the queen of the sciences is gone. At least in this respect, it is hard to uphold the Humboldtian vision.

Above, I have discussed some of the modern developments which have contributed to the marginalisation of philosophy among the modern sciences. Not least, the developments *within*

modern philosophy itself have lead to this marginalisation, and in this connection it is nevertheless, important to ask what has been lost in this rapid centrifugal process. In this context I would like to refer to Jürgen Habermas' discussion of the transition from logocentric to contextual reason.[19] The post-metaphysical accusations against philosophy have been devastating. Modern philosophy has been forced to adapt to the post-metaphysical surroundings and has consequently begun to argue for "the primacy of contextualism" -that everything must be understood in light of the situation-bound demands.

As a non-experimental science, philosophy developed an *universal* and therefore critical-rational attitude to the immediate experiences, in contrast to the empirical sciences. Modern philosophy of science, starting with Rudolf Carnap and Karl Popper, developed a strict and very limited conception of both empirical science and rationality. It is these limited conceptions which now have been questioned and broken up. A consequence might be that all rational criteria could be cast away in the process.

It is this tendency of "throwing out the baby with the bath water", which Habermas bemoans, because it can lead to the loss of critical understanding as such. I think this warning is worth considering: Once, philosophers were the bearers of this critical form of understanding against the advocates of the empirical sciences. The latter could only assert inductive and experienceable knowledge. The two realms of knowledge, expressed logically as deduction and induction, lay at the very heart of modern science. If the current pragmatization of knowledge and of philosophy leads to the absolute hegemony of inductive experience, our cognition could be reduced to a totally fragmented and situation-bound understanding. Deductive reasoning utilises the critical attitude which emanates from a universal, and therefore non-experienceable form of understanding. It is this critical element in philosophical understanding which should be preserved when philosophy is split up among the separate disciplines. With a lost transcendental sphere of substantive philosophical reason it is important for the university as a social institution to replace this sphere by a set of discursive procedures through which critical rationality can survive and flourish. In this regard the modern university has a unique mission -to mediate discursively the tradition of Reason when the old tradition, embedded in philosophy, is loosing its substantive base.

The unity of science and general social upbringing

To unify teaching/research with upbringing/formation of individuals is the third imperative in the Humboldtian vision of a university. Science in Humboldt's time was as much a practical-moral as a theoretical task. *Bildung* unites both elements.

ways develop in accordance with, but contrary to, its attributed exemplary role. The student revolts of the 1960s have been explained from a similar point of view.[20)]

If we contrast the closed university life, which also was a prerequisite for the unification of science and upbringing with the existing wide-open universities, the differences are obvious. The modern university is more or less "boundless". Today it is for example, impossible to say where the Swedish university actually ends, and to know who is a member of the academic republic. Neither, is there much left of the old privilege system which once constituted the university. The diverse interests at the university cannot be subsumed under any set of distinct privileges. The interest of the unions in securing reasonable working conditions and fair wages for university employees effectively undermines such privileges. The pomp and circumstances at graduations and jubilees are just reflexions of golden days long past, because "the right to speak" is no longer determined by a doctoral degree.

The university has neither retained its role as the prime socializor of the societal elite. It competes with a number of other social institutions, that can safeguard and defend modern citizenship more successfully. Today, TV and other massmedia are more important links between the state and the individual than the universities. The media can in a completely different way protect the critical contents of citizenship. Political parties represent the special interests of the population in relation to state and authorities, and unions are important vehicles for the social upbringing of individuals. Compared with these cultural and political mediators, the modern university is surprisingly modest. Its role as an educator of youth has of course been changing as the age structure of the students has changed. It remains doubtful whether the modern university contains *any* trace of the *polis* that Humboldt once promised and hoped for?

Nowadays, students seldom live in university-operated housing. The "nations"(fraternities originally established on a regional base) still function as land-lords, but for a rather limited number of students. In Sweden, these "nations" are privileged social institutions in so far as they are allowed to serve alcoholic beverages, but their role in the socialisation process is doubtful, at least beyond the purely sexual sphere. Large groups of students today live outside the university towns and commute. Being a student is no longer a full-time job. This is not even the case in doctoral education. More and more students in Sweden choose to study on a part-time basis. Even if it has been argued that the social structure of the student body is still rather narrow, especially in some departments(majors), there is no comparison with yesterday's elite university. The modern university is in many respects a flat social configuration.

An important factor is the age structure of modern students. It is quite normal to be a student for a while, go back to work, and then return to the university. For retired nurses and retired colonels, the university by no means represents an *Ersatz* for home. The university is to them no "total institution" but rather a meaningful way of spending their leisure time. The relationship between the university teachers and these new student groups is virtually turned upside down, since the teachers could equally well be the children of new students.

Neither is the relation between higher education and occupation as clear-cut as before. The younger students undoubtedly begin their studies with the ambition of being able to compete on a gradually tougher labor market. But even if the university furthers these ambitions, it doesn't in any way guarantee their realisation. The rapid turn-over of products and knowledge in industry, and the increasing specialisation of the labor market mean that long university educations quickly lose their market value. In the humanities, this is of course even more uncertain, as the older students have to a large extent already finished their active work life.

Today, the securing of the unity between science and upbringing, *Lehre und Leben*, demands other strategies than those proponed by Humboldt. It is a challenging task for the new open university to retain this unity in a completely new reality. The academic seminar for example, no longer presupposes a closed community of scholars, it is open to everybody who can participate in a "communication free from dominance" where the quality and relevance of the arguments is the only valid criteria. Academic seminars do not always function in accordance with this "regulative" idea, but the idea as such keeps it vital even today. The physical attributes of yesterday -such as walls- could be replaced by symbolic ones: to be a member of the university is to be a proponent of a special type of discourse, what the late Alvin Gouldner once called 'the culture of critical discourse'(CCD).[21] This endeavour must be both practical and theoretical: it must be a way of live.

The unity of science and enlightenment

The fourth and last imperative in the Humboldtian vision of a university deals with the unity of science and enlightenment. To Humboldt this was a part of the general enlightenment thought. With the help of science, man could finally free himself from all kinds of superstition. Using knowledge, people would finally be able to free themselves from their long slavery. Immanuel Kant's words "to dare to know" were indeed central to the conception of the university which developed in Germany at the beginning of the 19th century and later also in Scandinavia.[22] However, the enlightenment Humboldt referred to was limited to the spheres of culture and education. It did not include political and economic life.[23] The enlightened university should be the foundation of the *Bildungsbürgertum* which in its turn should be the back-bone of a *Kulturstaat*. This idea was an intellectual cousin to the contemporary idea of a

Rechtsstaat, and both were basically apolitical, and beyond worldly struggles. Their realization -and hence also the realization of the enlightened state- demanded, according to their proponents, a distance from day-to-day politics.

Since Humboldt, the unity of science and enlightenment has been thoroughly questioned. Karl Marx did not questioned the *idea* of unity between science and enlightenment, but rather the way in which it was used in bourgeois thinking. Knowledge was not an entity beyond and outside the struggles of politics and economy, instead it was an element of the struggle between classes. In a radical and intractable way Nietzsche disputed the unity between modern science and enlightenment. In the modern(enlightenment) science, there was a hidden "will to power", and anybody who out of Christian zeal denied this fact did not understand the character of theoretical knowledge. Today, similar views are proponed by, among others, Foucault and the so called postmodernists.[24] Instead of pursuing the dream of human freedom, the culmination of impersonal power followed in the tracks of the scientific revolution. Max Weber too, feared that modern empirical science would end in a paradox, and create the opposite to the Humboldtian "liberated man". The epilogue of "*The Protestant Ethic*" reads:

> "Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; and this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilisation never before attained".[25]

Today, the meaning of the concepts *science* and *research* have changed. Their connection to the formation and education of individual personalities can be questioned. Furthermore, it could be said that science has abandonned the idea of enlightenment at least since it created the most destructive weapons any civilisation has known. Modern industrial society has vigorously exploited the possibilities of science to instrumentalise and manipulate both outer and inner nature. The dream of a coming *Bildungsbürgertum* and a *Kulturstaat* appears to be very remote.

It would be remarkable if the university had not also been affected by "the dialectics of enlightenment".[26] The research university has formed a close alliance, especially with the state and industry and answered to the demands of the "system world" for "R&D"; i.e. products and knowledge to increase the level of efficiency and control. The educational demands and creation of identity is not automatically compatible with the efficiency criteria of modern research and is therefore left out. The student revolt of the 1960s was a reaction both against the lost educational role of the university and against its alliance with the state and business in the development of weapons for control and destruction.

It is possible that today's students are not as outspoken as the generation of the 1960s and early 70s, but they are by no means, naive supporters of science and research. It is not necessarily "the best and the brightest" who become researchers. There are many who simply turn

their backs on the departments of science and turn to subjects devoted to belief- and value systems such as history of religion and psychology, history of philosophy and ideas, or history of art. The university no longer represents the obvious home of education to modern students, and their choice of subjects must be seen as an expression of distrust in modern science, particularly in its will and ability to integrate education and enlightenment. Today there are signs of an escape from the rational to the apparently irrational, which is reinforced by the "post-metaphysics" that I referred to above.

The challenging question for the modern university has to do with its will to relate to the existing currents of thought. Will the university chose to ignore these thoughts by defining them as merely intellectual and temporary "modes"? Or will it begin to question its own lost role as procurer of education and identity? Such questions concern the university's position in the modern "knowledge society". The university is no longer the only authority that supplies knowledge. Instead, it is competing with several other actors on an increasingly competitive market. The questions relate to what sort of knowledge the university will protect to keep its intrinsic value as a university?

Today, one can detect a new will within the university to master this chaotic situation and to reestablish the university as a center of education and enlightenment. I am for instance, referring to the attempts at the University of Lund to establish a *core curriculum*. Even if these attempts are worth our encouragement, one has a feeling that they are characterised by a certain awkwardness and uncertainty of what a core curriculum should actually *mean* in the 1990s? Is there any common denominator of education and enlightenment in an increasingly differentiated system of knowledge and science? And must not such a common educational denominator eventually meet the same fate as philosophy did? In North America these questions have recently come to the fore in the controversy following Alan Bloom's book "*The Closing of the American Mind*".[27)]

Conclusion

Despite all I have said, I am nevertheless, concluding by praising the university. The unity of research and education that once constituted the modern university has been broken up. Today there are also tendencies to disconnect research and teaching; to establish academies of research, or to tie research to different sectors of society by establishing special institutes. If this happens, teaching at the university runs the risk of loosing everything. In my view, the university must in every way possible try to protect the unity of teaching and research and to reopen the discussion on how to achieve this in the present world.

In the last phase of the student revolt of the 1960s, Talcott Parsons questioned the modern university's one-sided emphasis on an increasingly specialised type of research. According to him, basic education had been the big loser in this process. Parsons tried to actualise the old Humboldtian vision in his idea of the American university. A too specialised research, too closely related to the demands of business, will, according to Parsons, eventually lead to the failure of the students to secure the broad individual sense of identity that modern democratic citizenship demands. When this happens the students will try to find their sense of identity outside the university, and to Parsons, this was a questionable and ominous development. Accordingly, the university has to uphold and reinforce its fundamental *raison d'ètre* -to form enlightened citizens.

There is an obvious danger in a type of research which narrows its area of activities to include very specialised demands. Existential questions are left outside rational testing. The gap between *Lehre und Leben* then becomes wider and wider, and the dialectic of enlightenment threatens to afflict reason itself. I believe that it is within this area, which touches upon both the identity-formation of the individual and of the community at large, that the future of the university lies. The university must critically examine contemporary systems of knowledge and of science. This critical examination includes of course the university's own activities. In the *Risikogesellschaft* in which we live science and technology are themselves producers of risks and of uncertainty.[28] To leave the questions of how individuals learn to live with uncertainty and dangers outside the realm of critical understanding would be to split modern consciousness into two irreconciliable halves, one dealing with the really important("non-researchable")questions of our age, and the other dealing with the abstracted specialisms of sterile research. Our universities did once have to question the Christian dogmas and their relation to the reality. Today the university may have to confront a dogma it, to a very high degree, created itself. Empirical science is not an innocent pursuit, it has consequences for our entire way of life.

In this time of a developing European Community, when the last(?) Humboldt link -between university and nation-state- is in the process of being cut, the university is in the midst of a new, and even epochal, change. It *could* be degraded to some kind of delivery-boy answering to the demands of a growing business community. But it could *also* develop into a counterveiling force and continue in the tradition of that Europe which gave rise to the universities in Bologna, Padua, Paris, Oxford and Prague and which fostered and safeguarded, through special institutional means, the universalism of man, his freedom and dignity. This universalistic attitude has been under attack in Europe, and hideous crimes against mankind have been committed. But our rage has been particularly ferocious when these crimes were instigated by men associated with the university.[29]

The European university was initially conceived in the small city-states of Northern Italy, and developed into significant institutions in the wake of the emerging nation-states in the 16th century. The question is how this millenial institution will fare in a continent that prides itself of becoming "borderless".

To find 'the unity in the manifold' without destroying the pluralism in the process is a challenging task for the new European university. This in many ways relates to the traditions of the travelling renaissance students. To their respective cultures they brought back a new concept of the individual which had revolutionary effects on the different local cultures. We can only speculate about the effects of the new European university, its impact on science and on learning. Will it be possible for "the citizen of the world"(Kant) to find a *locus parentis* there?

References

1 Jürgen Habermas, "The Idea of the University - Learning Processes", in *New German Critique*, nr 41, Spring-Summer 1987, p 3(*Habermas 1987*). For a more comprehensive discussion of the classical German ideal of a university, see Helmut Schelsky, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit*. Reinbek v. Hamburg 1963, and by the same author, *Abschied von der Hochschulpolitik*. Bielefeld 1963

2 Michael Zöller, *Die Unfähigkeit zur Politik. Politikbegriff und Wissenschaftverständnis von Humboldt bis Habermas*. Opladen 1975, especially pp 37-56(*Zöller 1975*)

3 *Habermas 1987*, p 4

4 For a discussion of the different background conditions, see Friedrich Tenbruch, "Bildung, Gesellschaft, Wissenschaft", in Dieter Obendorfer(Hg), *Wissenschaftliche Politik*, Darmstadt 1966.

5 *Habermas 1987*, p 11. Humboldt's classical discussion containing the "idea of the university" is to be found in Wilhelm von Humboldt, "Über die innere und äussere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin", in Ernst Arnrich(Hg), *Die Idee der deutschen Universität*. Darmstadt 1956

6 Joseph Ben-David, "Universities", in David Sills(ed), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York 1968, vol 16, pp 191-99(*Ben-David 1968*)

7 The Protestant reformer and Wittenberg-student, Olaus Petri in 16th century Sweden, is a good example of what studies abroad could result in

8 Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, *The American University*. Cambridge/Mass. 1973(*Parsons 1973*). See also *Ben-David 1968*

9 Steven Muller, "Humboldt und die Universitär in den USA" in Bernfried Schlerat(Hg), *Wilhelm von Humboldt, Vortragszyklus zum 150. Todestag*. Berlin 1986

10 *Parsons 1973*, pp 304-45

11 Neil Smelser, in *Parsons 1973*, pp 389-422

12 For a discussion of 'locals' and 'cosmopolitan', see Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, (revised and enlarged ed.) New York 1957

13 *Lunds Universitets Årskrönika*. 1987/88, pp 34.(Chronicle of Lund University 1987/88)

14 In the academic year 1987/88 only 28 % of all fulltime positions were teaching- and researchstaff.

15 Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton 1979

16 Habermas, *Nachmetaphysisches Denken*. Frankfurt 1988(*Habermas 1988*)

17 Jean Francois Lyotard, *La Condition Postmoderne*. Paris 1979

18 Karin Knorr-Cetina-Michael Mulkay(eds), *Science Observed, Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London 1983

19 *Habermas 1988*, pp 14-17

20 *Parsons 1973*, pp 304-45

21 Alvin Gouldner, *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York 1979

22 Nils Runeby, *"Ett otidigt och kärt främmande". Om den lärde, studenten, universitet och vår utbildningstradition*. FHS-rapport 17, Stockholm 1987.(On scholars, university and the tradition of higher education in Sweden.)

23 *Zöller 1975*

24 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*. New York 1979

25 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, transl. by T. Parsons. London 1968, p 182

26 Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, *The Dialectics of Enlightenment*. New York 1972

27 Alan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York 1987

28 Ulrich Beck, *Risikogesellschaft, Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main 1986

29 The examples of Martin Heidegger and Paul de Mann are illustrative examples of the rage recently stirred up in the European university community

Graphic Systems i Stockholm AB 1991